


 Australian Government AusAID	Quality at Entry report template
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document name: Quality at Entry Report Use with Instruction: How Do I Manage the Design of an Aid Activity? registered #109 Also see Guidelines: <i>Completing A Quality at Entry Report</i>, and <i>Independent Appraisal and Peer Review</i> Business Process Owner: Quality and Performance Systems Branch Contact for help: qualityreports@ausaid.gov.au Current from 15 June 2011 – 30 June 2012 <p style="text-align: center;">Highlight and delete this box and text before using!</p>	

 Australian Government AusAID	Quality at Entry Report for
---	------------------------------------

A: AidWorks details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
Initiative Name:			
Initiative No:		Total Amount:	
Start Date:		End Date:	

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>	
Initial ratings prepared by:	
Meeting date:	
Chair:	
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	–
Independent Appraiser:	–
Other peer review participants:	–

C: Safeguards and Commitments (completed by Activity Manager)		
<i>Answer the following questions relevant to potential impacts of the activity.</i>		
1. Environment	Have the environmental marker questions been answered and adequately addressed by the design document in line with legal requirements under the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act</i> ?	Yes/No
2. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	Yes/No/N/A

D: Initiative/Activity description *completed by Activity Manager (no more than 300 words per cell)*

3. Description of the Initiative/Activity	<i>What is it?</i>
4. Objectives Summary	<i>What are we doing?</i>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating *(no more than 300 words per cell)*

Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6) *	Required Action (if needed) ‡
1. Relevance	<i>Why are we doing this?</i>		
2. Effectiveness	<i>Will it work?</i>		
3. Efficiency	<i>How will we do it?</i>		
4. Monitoring & Evaluation	<i>How will we know?</i>		
5. Sustainability	<i>Will benefits last?</i>		

6. Gender Equality	<i>How will we achieve gender equality?</i>		
7. Analysis and Learning	<i>Have we thought this through?</i>		

* Definitions of the Rating Scale:			
Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
6	Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only	3	Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
5	Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas	2	Poor quality; needs major work to improve
4	Adequate quality; needs some work to improve	1	Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

‡ **Required actions (if needed):** These boxes should be used wherever the rating is less than 5, to identify actions needed to raise the rating to the next level, and to fully satisfactory (5). The text can note recommended or ongoing actions.

F: Next Steps <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>		
Provide information on all steps required to finalise the design based on <i>Required Actions</i> in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
1.		
2.		
3.		

G: Other comments or issues <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">

H: Approval <i>completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting</i>		
On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:		
<input type="checkbox"/> QAE REPORT IS APPROVED , and authorization given to proceed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> FINALISE the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementation or: <input type="radio"/> REDESIGN and resubmit for appraisal peer review 		
<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPROVED for the following reason(s): _____ _____ _____		
	signed:	

When complete:

- Copy and paste the approved ratings, narrative assessment and required actions into AidWorks and attach the report.
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file

Quality Criteria - Consider these questions when assessing:

Relevance – “Why are we doing this?”

- Is the specific role of Australian aid (aid objectives) in contributing to a Partner's priority development outcomes clearly articulated?
- Does the activity contribute to higher level objectives of the Australian aid program as outlined in a Partnership for Development, and/or relevant country, regional and thematic strategy?
- Does the activity target priority needs not addressed by other development partners, and/or how is Australia otherwise seeking to harmonise its assistance?
- If working with/through another partner (e.g. UN, WB, PIFS), consider *both* the clarity and relevance of Australian *objectives for the partnership*, (why we chose to work this way) and the partner's aid objective(s) *vis a vis* the development context, partner priorities and beneficiaries' needs.
- Is the design relevant to the context specific analysis and lessons? i.e. does contextual analysis clearly inform:
 - the proposed approach to addressing the identified development issues?
 - the modality and financing arrangements selected?

Effectiveness – “Will it work?”

- Are the objectives for this activity (aid objectives), clear, measurable and achievable within the stated timeframe?
- Is it clear how we think change will occur (theory of change) i.e.:
 - are the relationships linking analysis, objectives and our approach clear and plausible?
 - are the underlying assumptions clearly outlined?
- Are main risks and plans to prevent or mitigate them identified?
- Does the design identify key partnerships which may contribute to achieving objectives?

Efficiency – “How will we do it?”

- Are proposed technical solutions and associated implementation arrangements high quality, appropriate to the context and good value for money?
- Where appropriate, are implementation arrangements harmonised with other donors and aligned with partner government systems?
- Are roles and responsibilities of all development partners and all actors involved in activity implementation clearly identified?
- Is the activity adequately and appropriately resourced to achieve the desired objectives?

Monitoring and Evaluation – “How will we know?”

- Will proposed monitoring and evaluation help us to know how it is all working? Do proposed arrangements clearly support management, accountability and lessons-learning needs (including ongoing quality and performance reporting)?
 - is it focused on priority information needs and not overly complex?
 - is it clear what will be assessed, by whom, when and how (including baselines where appropriate)?
 - can this also inform analysis and judgement of contribution to/achievement against higher level objectives of the program?
- Will data be gender-disaggregated to measure impact on men and women, boys and girls?
- Will monitoring and evaluation arrangements use or contribute to strengthening local monitoring and evaluation systems and/or capacity? If strengthening the capacity of partner performance management is an *objective of the activity*, will this be tracked and managed accordingly? (Note this would then need to be identified in the Objectives summary and assessed against “Effectiveness”.)
- Is monitoring and evaluation adequately resourced?
- Where we are jointly implementing with other partners and/or funders, are there *AusAID specific objectives* for engagement in the activity/partnership, and do monitoring and evaluation arrangements address this?

Sustainability – “Have we planned for benefits to last?”

- Is it clear what sustainable benefits/change the activity aims to generate? Is sustainability in fact an aim of, or reasonably achievable by, the activity? Benefits may be assessed in terms of either or both:
 - objectives/outcomes – what the activity itself is aiming to achieve (Australian aid objectives), and what would result for that in terms of immediate or longer-term shared development outcomes; and
 - processes – how the activity will operate.
- Have specific constraints to sustainability, in the context of the proposed activity, been identified and addressed?
 - this should include consideration of financial, human resource and political constraints
- Are the strategies for achieving sustainability explicit?
 - are they integral to the activity objectives, approaches and monitoring and evaluation?
- How likely are beneficiaries and/or partner country stakeholders to have sufficient ownership, capacity and resources to maintain desired activity outcomes after Australian Government funding has ceased?
- How well are any **emerging environmental, climate and disaster challenges** (e.g. extreme weather events, resource degradation, pollution, disasters and climate change related impacts) or opportunities (e.g. for Disaster Risk Reduction or adaptation) being addressed in activity design?
- Does the activity aim to build resilience to cope with changing conditions and future uncertainties?
- How is the design ensuring no significant negative environmental impacts are likely (including complying with the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act) and does it pursue opportunities to enhance the environment?

How will monitoring and evaluation be used to assess and report on environmental sustainability of the activity?

Gender equality – “How are we going to achieve it?”

- How will the activity contribute to advancing gender equality or support women's and men's equal engagement in, and benefit from, the activity?
- How well does the design integrate gender equality into objectives and the consideration of risks and sustainability?
- Does the design identify how the activity will work to develop capacity on gender equality objectives of program staff, counterparts, development partners, and/or the broader community?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation framework able to assess and report on progress towards gender equality results?
- Does the design propose gender expertise be accessed during implementation?
- Does the design provide for gender equality considerations and impacts at the policy level and with counterparts at the program level?
- Will the monitoring and evaluation assess and report on progress towards desired gender equality objectives, outcomes and impact?

Analysis and Learning – “How well have we thought this through?”

- Does analysis takes into account (as appropriate) political, institutional, economic, financial, organisational and human resource issues?
- Are lessons from previous experience in the sector and/or country taken into account?
- Does sufficient analysis underpin the theory of change?
- Does the analysis appropriately address and integrate other agency commitments and safeguards including gender equality, disability, environment, anti-corruption and child protection?
- Does the analysis take into account which partnerships are going to be critical in achieving the objectives and why?

Safeguards and Commitments

As part of activity design and implementation, attention is typically given to the risk **posed to** the success or effectiveness of an activity, and less often on the risk of potential harm **caused by** an activity. Policies and procedures that address the potential risk of harm that can result from an aid activity are known as **safeguards**. Cross-cutting policies and procedures aim to improve aid quality and effectiveness, while safeguards policies and procedures aim to “do no harm”. Cross-cutting issues often have “safeguard” implications, but not all safeguard issues will be cross-cutting issues. In AusAID, the following areas have both cross-cutting and safeguard implications. This section will be progressively added to as further guidance on safeguards issues is developed along with corresponding questions that must be addressed before commencing and initiative in AidWorks.

Environment (see the Guideline, [Integrating Environment into Activity Design](#))

If there are environmental impacts that need to be considered, appropriate action needs to be taken from the very beginning in the design. Assess whether the design has answered and addressed the following questions:

1. Is the activity in an environmentally sensitive location or sector?
2. Is there potential for the activity to have an impact on the environment?
3. Is the explicit, or implicit, aim of the activity to have a positive environmental impact?
4. Is the activity relevant to multilateral environmental agreements?
5. Could the activity have significant negative environmental impacts?

Consider both the impact of the design and implementation phases, and of the ongoing activity, and what, if any, action is required to comply with the EPBC Act.

For additional information see [AusAID's Environmental Management Guide for Australia's Aid Program](#) or contact the Sustainable Development Group on +61 2 6206 4174.

Child Protection - AusAID's Child Protection Policy provides a clear framework for managing and reducing risks of child abuse by persons engaged in delivering Australian aid program activities. This policy applies to all AusAID staff, including those based overseas, and to all contractors and non-government organisations funded by AusAID. See guidance, [Child Protection Procedure Manual](#) (page 4), and the [Child Protection Policy](#).

Choose **N/A** if the activity does not involve working with children or if the activity is to be implemented by one of the following:

1. Partner Government
2. An Australian Whole of Government Partner
3. Multilateral organisations
4. Donor governments

For additional information contact the Child Protection Officer on +61 2 6206 4184 or email CPO@ausaid.gov.au